of Nemours and Aumale, to their friends and adherents in Paris, in which they recommended forgetfulness of the past and union for the future, were read at select parties of the friends of both branches assembled at the house of the Marquis de Pastoret. The good Queen Amelie's name was also made use of to influence her numerous and devoted admirers. In short, it appeared as if the fusion was to be as complete as its most carnest supporters could desire.

Unfortunately all these hopes are already vanishing. The personal feelings and personal ambition of some of the actors are too deeply engaged in the question. A small but important section of the Orleanists, who would be atterly aminhilated by the return of the elder branch, still hold out for the cause of the Cemte de Paris and the regency of the Duchess of Orleans. M. Thiers and some of his friends are too deeply compromised by the affair of the Duchess of Berri, and by their opinions on religious questions, to hope for favor or mercy from Henry V., or the High Church party; and the Duchess of Orleans herself is said to be still buoyed up with the hope that the day is not distant when her son will be called back by the general voice of France. These fears and hopes are an effectual bar to a complete fusion, and as some of the principal leaders of the party in question seem to prefer the republic itself to the return of Henry V., the opposition will probably be an injury to the interests of the family.

Within the last few days an affair has turned up which is still more dangerous to the cause of Henry V. A schism has already arisen between the fusion.

Within the last few days an affair has turned up which is still more dangerous to the cause of Henry V. A schism has already arisen between the fasionists. The old adherents of the cause of the elder branch think that the family of Louis Philippe ought mot to confine their support of the cause of Henry V. to private assurances given to the Comte de Chambord himself, and rivate letters to their friends in Paris. They insist that the princes of the House of Orleans should (in imitation of the conduct of Comte de Chambord, who, in his letter to M. Berryer, has hinted at the reconciliation between the two branches) publish a public demonstration in favor of Henry V. To this the princes and their adherents demur. They say that in withdrawing their opposition to Henry V. they have done all that can be expected of them; that they cannot go further without declaring Henry V. they have done all that can be expected of them; that they cannot go further without declaring Louis Philippe an usurper; that as they abided by the decision of France in 1830, when the nation almost unanimously placed Louis Philippe on the throne, so they are ready at the present moment to abide by her present determination as to the choice of a ruler; and that if the choice of France should fall upon the Comte de Chambord, they will not only not do anything to retard the accomplishment of that wish, but will be the first to adhere to it. This answer does not, by any means, satisfy the legitithat wish, but will be the first to adhere to it. This answer does not, by any means, satisfy the legitimists, and the dispute runs so high, that it has already almost annihilated all hopes of a sincere reconciliation of the parties. The recent result of M. Creton's proposition for the repeal of the laws which exile the Bourbons, has increased the difficulty. M. Berryer declared that the Comte de Chambord will never enter France except as king; and the princes of Orleans refuse to enter into negotiations until they are allowed to do so on the soil of France. The consequence is, that the opposition given by M. Berryer to M. Creton's proposition, has widened the division between the branches.

Taking the Vell.
THE PETITION OF CRAVEN FITZHARDINGE BERKELEY
TO THE HON. THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, IN PARLIA-

DOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, IN FARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.
Humbly showeth:—That he intermarried with
Augusta Talbot, the widow of George Henry Talbot, who was the half-brother of the present Earl of
Shrewsbury.
That the said George Henry Talbot left two
children him surviving, namely, John, who was heir
presumptive to the Earldom, and Augusta, an infant,
now of the age of 19 years and upwards.
That the said infant, Augusta Talbot, resided
with your petitioner and her mother up to the time
of the death of the latter, which took place on the
20th day of April, 1841.

25th day of April, 1841.

That since that period, and up to the month of September last, the said infant, Augusta Talbot, has resided with the Earl and Counters of Shrews-

That in consequence of the death of the said John Talbot, the said infant, Augusta Talbot, became absolutely entitled to a sum of £80,000, or there-

Talbot, the said infant, Augusta Talbot, became absolutely entitled to a sum of £80,000, or thereabouts.

That the said infant, Augusta Talbot, is a ward of the Court of Chancery.

That in the month of September last, the said Countess and Earl of Shrewsbury placed the said infant, Augusta Talbot, (notwithstanding she is a ward of Court, as aforesaid,) at the convent called the Lodge, situate at Taunton, in the country of Someriet, not as a pupil or visiter, but as a postulant, with the avowed object of allowing the said Augusta Talbot to take the veil and become a nun. That in the month of September next the period of probation or postulancy will have expired, and the said infant, Augusta Talbot, will be compelled by the rules and regulations of the said convent, and by the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church, to take the white veil during her minority, and notwithstanding the said infant, Augusta Talbot, is a ward of the Court of Chancery.

That, having taken the white veil, there is no retreat for the said infant, Augusta Talbot, and she will be compelled to take the black veil in September, 1852, or shortly alterwards.

That on the 6th day of June, 1852, the said infant, Augusta Talbot, will attain her twenty-first year, when she will become entitled to receive the said sum of £80,000.

That, being a nun at that period, the £30,000

year, when she will become entitled to receive the sa d sum of £80,000.

That, being a nun at that period, the £30,000 will become confiscated to the said convent, or to the cechs astical revenues of the Church of Rome, or to the endowment, enrichment, or maintenance of some bishopric or deanery, or other ecclesiastical benefice of the said Church of Rome; or the said infant, Augusta Talbot, will be compelled by some assurance in the law to transfer all her right and

assurance in the law to transfer all her right and interest in the said sum of £80,000.

That it is one of the doctrines of the Church of Rome that no member of the said church shall be permitted to exercise his or her private judgment in teligious matters, but that in all such religious matters he or she is bound to submit to the authority of the said Romish Church, and to the direction of the priesthood thereof.

That in a certain work by Nicholas Wiseman, who is a high exclasinatical authority in the Romish

who is a high ecclesiastical authority in the Romish Church, on the principal dectrines and practices in the said Romish Church, under the head of "Lecture I.," intoduction, page 16, the following passage occure."—"The Catholic Church is thus as a city to which avenues lead from every side, towards which nen may travel from any quarter by the most diversified roads, by the thoray and rugged ways of stret investigation, by the more flowery paths of sentiment and feeling, but arrived at its precincts, all find that there is but one door to the sheepfold—narrow and low, perhaps, and causing flesh and blood to stoop as it passes in. They may wander about its outskirts, they may admire the goodliness of its edifices and its bulwarks, but they cannot be its denires and children if they enter not by tlat one gate of absolute unconditional submission to the teaching of the church."

That in the said work, under the head of Lecture III., page 76, the following passage occurs.—"For the moment any Catholic doubts, not alone the principle of his faith, but any of those doctrines which are thereon based, the moment headlows himself to call in question any of the dogmas which the Catholic Church teaches as having been handed down within her, that moment the Church conceives him to have virtually abandoned all connexion with her; for she exacts such implicit obedience that if any member, however valuable, however he may have deveted his early talents to the illustration of her doctrines, full away from his belief in any one point, he is cut off without reserve; and we have in our own times seen striking and awful instances of this fact."

That the above opinions and declarations of the said Nicholas Wieman are the true doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, and that the said infant, Augusta Talbot, is about to the will and dictation of the superior of the ead convent, and to the prischood of the Church of Rome.

That your petitioner is deprived of all connection and connection with his stepdaughter, the said infant, Augusta

the veil therein, and appropriating their property thereto, either by placing such establishments under the supervision of inspectors, appointed by govern-ment, or by such other means as to the Hon. House may seem best calculated to put a stop to the afore-

may seem best calculated to put a stop to the afor-said practices.

And your petitioner will ever pay.

CRAVEN FITZHARDINGS BERKELEY.

PERKELEY-HOUSE, Spring-gardens.

LONDON, Friday, March 21, 1851—5 P M. The demand for almost every description of colonial and foreign produce has been very limited this week, and for many articles lower prices have been accepted as will be seen by the subjoined remarks. Cotton has however, been an exception, prices having railied fully 15d, per lb. By the arrival of the overland mail, to-day, we have received advices to the following dates:—Bom-Lay 15th, Calcutta 8th, Colombo 14th February; Can-ton 28th, Shanghae 18th, Batavia 27th, and Manilla 23d

in demand to notice.

Corron.—At public sale yesterday there was no dispo

in demand to notice.

Cottos.—At public sale yesterday there was no disposition to purchase, and the whole quantity, comprising 2100 bales Madras, 970 Surat and 140 Bengal, was withdrawn. The sales by private contract have been confined to 1,000 bales Surat, without change in value. At Liverpool there is a firmer market sand American Cotton is fully ½6 dearer; mid. Orleans 7 3-16d a 7½d.

Cochiesa.—160 blags have been offered at public sale, principally Honduras silver, which have realized 3s. 4d. a 3s. 9d. 4, with a few black at 3s. 9d. a 4s. 4d. Mexican silver would bring 3s. 2d.; it is held at 3s. 3d. Small partenly was realized at 30s., being rather easier.

Cochies.—The Trading Company's second sale of 115, 197 bags, which took place at Rotterdam on the 13th instant, went off brickly, the whole finding ready buyers from 27½ a 33 cents, or fully on a par with their previous sale at Amesterdam. The public sales this week have been numerous, comprising 80 casks. 1900 bags plantation, and 650 bags native Ceylon, 2,000 bags African, and 300 bags Java. The Ceylon was mostly sold from 49s. 6d. a 46s. for native, with plantation kinds from 49s. a 56s. and Costa Rica 46s. 6d. a 56s.; for the other descriptions there was no demand, and they were withdrawn. The increased estimates of crop contained in the Rio advices of the 10th of February, flattened the market for the moment, and 41s. was the highest offer obtainable for a cargo of good first Rio afloat; we are now, however, firmer, and 42s. has since been refused for one for a near port. From the Continental ports, the accounts are fairly satisfactory. The following were the imports and stecks on the 1st instant:—

Imports.

Stocks.

Great Britain, 1bs. ...6, 100,000 6,000,000 79,000,000 79,000,000 70,000,000 70,000

Our Albany Correspondence ALBANY, April 2, 1851.

The Bull and Suydam Affair in the Senate-The Report—The Conclusion—The Discharge of Bull.
The whole community hereabouts expected that
the report in relation to the Bull conspiracy would be presented in the Senate this morning; consequently, at an early hour, the Senate chamber became filled to overflowing, and when Mr. Morgan arose every eye was directed upon him, and the

most intense silence prevailed. A solemnity pervaded every countenance, and the vast assembly listened with breathless silence while the report was being read by Mr. Bogart, the Clerk. The three Senators whom Bull has so unjustly implicated, sat in their seats, dejected in countenance and depressed in spirits. The audience, crowded and large as it was, added to the gloominess of the scene; and when that portion of the report was being read which states that Senators Robinson, Stone and Johnson had committed an act of gross official misconduct—thereby receiving in public and in their places a severe reprimand—a feeling of sorrow for them appeared manifest through the whole audience. The hearts of all were touched, and none more so than Messrs. Morgan, Mann and Dimmick, the select committee who presented the report. Those three gontlemen each addressed the Senate, at the conclusion of the reading of the report and testimony. They agreed in the severity of that portion which alluded to the three unfortunate Senators; but, disagreeable as the duty was, they were compelled to vindicate the honor and purity of the Senate, at whatever cost, and whoever might be sacrificed in the attempt. Personally, their faults might charitably have been covered with the clook of commisseration—personally, they were willing to overlook the frailties of human nature—individually, they would gladly have spunged out the stain which Bull had brought upon their characters; but as Senators, while acting for the whole people, and, as in duty bound, to preserve the dignity and respectability of the Senate of the State of New York, thus were bound, under their coaths, to present the facts, and such deductions from the facts as appeared to them right, just, and proper.

The report was drawn up by the able, impartial. Stone and Johnson had committed an act of gross

the facts as appeared to them right, just, and proper.

The report was drawn up by the able, impartial, and pungent pen of Senator Mann, fully agreed to by the other two members of the committee. In consequence of the report containing a very severe rebuke upon the conduct of the three unfortunate Schalors, an attempt was made by Senator Geddes and others, who are men overflowing with the milk of human kindness, to soften down the harsh expressions in the report, so that the records of this unprecedented transaction might be somewhat white washed. Mr. Morgan stated distinctly that the report, as read, was the unanimous judgment of the committee, upon the most mature reflection, and examination of the testimony; and that referring the report for amendment in any particular, would not be entirely futile and unnecessary as the report would be altered, crased, or amended as the report would be aftered, crased, or amended. The committee was discharged, the report accepted

and a record placed on file, stating that these Senators had been guilty of misconduct. This will ever remain on the journals of the proceedings of this day, and it is not likely that it ever will be erased or obliterated, but remain through all time as a mirror for Senators, who shall fill the seats of those here at present, during the continuance of the State government.

The resolution discharging G. W. Bull from the office of Sergeant-as-Arms was unanimously adopted, with an audible aye; and Senators breathed freer, rafer, ard easier, after having performed that willing duty. A resolution was offered to thrust him into prison until the close of the session, as an additional punishment, but the Senate was not prepared to-day, to pursue the victim any further.

The Black Mail Case in the New York
Senate.
THE TESTIMONY REFERE THE COMMITTEE OF IN

Monday, March 31.—Present, Messrs. Morgan, Chairman, Mann, and Dimmick.

Samuel A. Suydam, examined—Q. What is your place of residence and occupation?

A. I reside at No. 14 Barclay street, in the city of New York; I am engaged in no business whatever.

of New York; I am engaged in no business whatever.
Q. How do you occupy your time?
A. By reading, and other amusements.
Q. Do you keep a house at which gambling is permitted?
[It was stated to the witness that he was not bound to answer any question that will tend to criminate himself.]
A. I decline answering that question, by my privilege.
Q. Do you know George W. Bull?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you first know him?
A. I do not remember the date, but I think the 22d of last February was the first time I ever saw him.

him.
Q. Where did you then see him?
A. At my private residence, No. 14 Barclay street.
Q. Did he call on you at that time in pursuance of any previous arrangement or understanding between you?
A. I never heard of him, or saw him, before that day.

A. I never heard of him, or saw him, before that day.

Q. State what took place, and what was said between you on that occasion?

A. He asked me if my name was Suydam, and that he wished to have a private interview with me. I told him to be seated. He then commenced by informing me that there was a bill before this body, and that it was to be presented by his friends, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Stone. They then had the bill, and he could stop its passage, at least for this session. I told him its passage or rejection did not affect me in the least. He asked me, then, if I had not friends that it might. I told him it was quite possible. He then said he would undertake to do it for a consideration. I don't recollect anything particular more that occurred at that interview, only he said he would write to me when he got to Albany, or as soon as he saw his friends.

Q. Is that all that occurred at that interview, to the best of your recollection?

A. At present, this is all that I can recollect.

Q. How long did Mr. Bull stay at your place at that time?

A. About twenty minutes.

Q. Did you see him again before he returned to Albany on the same or the next day?

A. My impression is that I did not.

Q. Did you request Mr. Bull, in this interview, to endeavor to prevent the passage of the bill to which he referred?

A. I did not. I told him I knew it was impossible to pass such a bill.

Q. Did you hold out to Mr. Bull, at that time,

A. I did not. I told him I knew it was impossible to pass such a bill.

Q. Did you hold out to Mr. Bull, at that time, that you would give him any consideration to defeat the bill?

A. I did not.

Q. Did you name to him any other persons who you thought would be interested in defeating the passage of the bill?

A. I did not.

Q. Did you name to him any persons who you thought would be interested in the passage of the bill?

A. I do not remember

bill?

A. I do not remember.
Q. Can you say that you did not mention to him
the names of any persons that you thought would
be interested in the passage of the bill, either for or

be interested in the passage of the bill, either for or against it?

A. No, I cannot say.

Q. Do you believe that you did not name to him any such persons at that time?

A. My impression is that I did not.

Q. Did Mr. Bull, on that occasion, state to you the substance of the bill?

A. He showed me either the original or a copy.

Q. Did you read it?

A. I read part of it, and as soon as I read so far, I saw the object, and handed it back to him.

Q. Did he state to you that the bill had been introduced or was about to be introduced?

A. I am under the impression that he said it was to be presented and suppressed afterwards.

Q. Was the bill he showed to you on the 22d of February, a printed bill?

A. No,

Q. You have stated that you read a portion of the bill—was the bill in manuscript, shown by Mr. Bull on the 22d February, the same as the printed bill now shown?

A. It was substantially.

A. In a few days I received this letter from Mr. now shown?

A. It was substantially.
Q. When did you next hear from Mr. Bull?
A. In a few days I received this letter from Mr. Bull.
[Witness here produced a letter dated 27th February, marked A.]
Q. How did you receive that?
A. The postman brought it.
Q. Did you make any reply to that letter from Mr. Bull?

I think I saw him in six or eight days there-After at my residence.
Q. State what took place at that second inter-

Q. State what took place at that second interview?

A. I had received a newspaper stating that such a bill had been presented, with that part marked. Mr. Bull asked me if I had received the paper sent me, noticing the presentment of the bill. I told him I had received the paper. He told me he would be sure to have it stopped; that he had arranged it with Mr. Johnson, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Stone, and that it was going to cost him six hundred dollars immediately, and he wanted to know how much I could assist him. I told him I would let him know some other time; I would see him again. He said he was going to leave for Albany that day, and would write me. It was at that interview he in quired where certain gentlemen lived.

Q. Is that all that took place at that interview? A. All that I can remember, except as to the inquiry where certain gentlemen lived.

Q. Did you give him the residence of certain gentlemen about whom he enquired?

A. Yes.

O. What are the names of those persons?

A. Yes.
Q. What are the names of those persons?
[The witness declined answering this question, and the committee decided that he was bound to answer it.] A. Henry Colton, Reuben Parsons, Joseph J. Hall, Mr. Wallace, Orlando Moore, Patrick S.

Q. Are you acquainted with all these individuals?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know the occupation of these per-A. I don't know that they are engaged in any

A. I don't know that they are engaged many business.

Q. Do you know that they keep gaming houses?
A. It is my impression they do.
Q. Did you have another interview with Mr. Bull before he returned to Albany on that occasion?
A. I think not.
Q. Did you at that time hold out to him the idea hat you would give him a consideration for defeating the bill?
A. I believe he was under that impression from what I allowed him to say to me, and not what I said to him.
Q. What kind of consideration did you encourage him to expect?

Q. What kind of consideration did you encourage him to expect?

A. He expected money.
Q. When did you next hear from Mr. Buillafter the second interview?

A. I next received the letter dated March 17, marked B.
Q. How did you receive that letter—through what channel?

what channel?

A. My servant handed it to me. It was left at the door.

he door.

Q. Did it not come through the Post Office?

A. I do not know—it had no post mark on it.

Q. Did you reply to that letter?

A. No.
Q. When did you next see or hear from Mr.
Eull after the receipt of that letter?
A. When the Legislature visited New York,
March 25, March 26. I think I saw him those

March 25. March 25. I think I saw him those days.

Q. Where did you first see him on that occasion?

A. I never saw him except at my own residence and in this chamber.

Q. Will you state what took place on the first interview with Mr. Bull at that time?

A. He remarked that his friends were here, Messis, Robinson, Johnson and Stone, and be offered to give me the original bill that he had in his lowersion, and intimated that he wanted me to give him money. I asked him if he had got any of anybody else? He said he was promised some the next day. I saked him to introduce me to Mesers, Robinson, or Johnson, or Stone. He said that he did not know about Mr. Robinson, but that he knew that Mr. Johnson or Mr. Stone would come there. I insisted upon being introduced to Mr. Robinson. He said he would go to the Astor House and see if he could effect it. I told him I would be in all that day, and asked him to call again. This was the morning of the first day the Legislature arrived. He said he would call the next day. The next day I saw him.

O. What time on Saturdar did you see him!

Q. What time on Saturday did you see him!

A. It was after twelve o'clock, and it may have been seven in the evening. It was on Saturday, and I don't remember the hour. Q. Is that all that took place on the first inter-

iew on Saturday?

A. I believe so.
Q. What hour did he call on the next day, Sun

A. I think it was dusk. Q. State what took place on that occasi time?

A. I then repeated my desire for a personal interview with the committee. He asked me the object I had. I told him I wanted to be satisfied that what he was telling me was actually the case. He told me the next day he would do it. He told me he had received two hundred and fifty dollars from Henry Colton, in consideration of Mr. Parsons, Mr. Hall, and Mr. Wallace, and that he was to receive one hundred dollars from Patrick S. Hearn. He was to come to see me next day at 12 o'clock. He left me. Q. Did he let you know the day it was introduced?

A. No.

Q. Where was Senator Robinson on the 27th February; and had you seen him at all, between the time of going to New York, on the 21st February and 28th February?

A. On my return from New York on the morning of the 25th February; if my memory serves me, Senator Robinson was out of the city—at any rate, I did not see him, to have conversation with him between the periods stated, on that bill or any other subject of legislation.

Q. In what way did you succeed in getting him to postpone the introduction of the bill?

A. Simply because he was not here to do so.

Q. What Senators, if any, did you retain, ostensibly to defend a suit, who were to speak against the bill, and assist you in any way to kill it?

A. Not one.

Q. What arrangements, if any, in relation to the bill, have you made with Mr. Mills, the Deputy Clerk?

A. None, other than to request him to keep me advised of its introduction, that I might keep the watch of it.

Q. Was there, at any time, any understanding between you and any of the members of the Senate, in relation to any compensation either you or they were to receive to procure the defeat of such bill?

A. Before heaven! there was not.

oft me.

Q. Have you named all the persons from whom
told you be bad received money?

one hundred dollars from Patrick S. Hearn. He left me.

Q. Have you named all the persons from whom he told you he had received money?

A. I have up to that time.

Q. And have you stated all that took place at that interview?

A. I have—all that I can remember.

Q. When did you next have an interview with Mr. Bull?

A. The next day, about the middle of the day.

Q. State what took place on that occasion.

A. He told me that he could convince me, but that the committee did not like to come down to my house. He asked me if he should bring it to me in writing, if that would satisfy me; and told me I could have it in writing or could have it personally with those gentlemen. He said he was in a hurry to go up to Mr. Hearns and that he would call back about dusk, and then exhibited the letter marked C. He read it to me, and I asked him to let me read it. He did so. I requested to retain it. He told me the committee had made him promise not to part with it before they would sign the letter. He told me he would go and ask their permission, and let me know. He then left me, taking the letter with him. I then consulted a friend, whether I should have it in writing or have half a dozen gentlemen to listen to it, concealed behind my curtains when they were released from their brackets. He told me, black and white was better than anything, to say nothing of the unmanliness to which a listener would be subjected. I then consulted with him how I should obtain the letter. There were two friends that I consulted. They advised me that if I saw it again, to possess myself of it. I said I would. Mr. Bull returned and asked me if I doubted the signatures of that letter. I answered him I did not doubt the genuineness of the signatures. I now wish to state of the letter marked C, that Mr. Bull informed me that he wrote both sides of this letter, except the signatures of Mr. Robinson, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Stone. He informed me that he had received one hundred dollars from Orlando Moore. He said he would let me have that letter with th

tive was to honor it by sending a check payable to the order of Mr. Robinson. I did not communicate that motive to him.

Q. Is that all that took place at that interview?

A. All that I can recellect of at present.

Q. Did you send any check, as contemplated?

A. Two friends of mine advised me not to do it, or to wait long enough for him to draw on me from Albany, but to proceed immediately and lay the sfair before the Senate; I took their advice, and did not send any money or check to Mr. Bull.

Q. Did Mr. Bull draw on you for any money from Albany?

A. If he has, I have not been advised of anything of that sort.

Q. At the time Mr. Bull left with you the lettor marked "C.," did he state what amount of funds he wished you to send to him, in consideration of leaving the letter?

A. No.

Q. Did he at any time state what amount of funds he wanted from you?

Q. Did he at any time state what amount of funds he wanted from you?

A. I think that he did intimate once that he wanted two hundred and fifty dollars; I don't remember what he said he wanted to do with this two hundred and fifty dollars that he intimated. He added that he had borrowed six hundred dollars, and owed it up here in Albany, to pay for what had been done to suppress that bill—the original of which he had then in his pocket.

Q. At what interview was this?

A. The last one.

Q. Did he show you the original bill at that time?

He offered to give it to me.
Did you take it?
I did not.
Was it a manuscript bill?
I did not see it.

Have you ever given any money to Mr. Bull

Q. Have you ever given any money to Mr. Bull?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever promise to give him any money?
A. I never promised him in any other way than
I have already mentioned.
Q. Did you ever have any interview in any manner with the Committee of the Senate named?
A. I never had any dealings with the committee
save as I have already mentioned through Mr.
Bull.
Q. Are you acquainted with the Committee of bill was introduced.

Q. How did you first learn that it was referred to

ner with the Committee of the Senate named?

A. I never had any dealings with the committee save as I have already mentioned through Mr. Bull.

Q. Are you acquainted with the Committee of the Senate, Messrs. Robinson, Johnson, and Stone?

A. No.

(Signed) S. A. SUYDAM.

Chairman here stated that if any members of the Select Committee had any questions to ask of Mr. Suydam, they or Mr. Bull now had an opportunity.

Cross-committee had any questions to ask of Mr. Suydam, they or Mr. Bull now had an opportunity.

Cross-committee had any questions to ask of Mr. Bull called upon you last Monday evening and refused to let you have the letter marked C. on the grounds that it was obtained from the committee under the express and solemn stipulation that it should not leave his possession, but be back in a specified time, did he refuse any money offered for the letter?

A. My belief is, that I intimated to him that I would give him a cheek, or that he might draw on me from Albany; he declined, and said he would go to the Astor House and see what he could do. As he was going out, I told him I would not promise him any money, as, that, before I parted with five hundred dollars, I must know where or for what it was going. He left me.

Q. Did Mr. Bull, during the interview, appear touched or express surprise that you, after his having acted in this whole matter with such seeming confidence, should be afraid to trust him with the money on his word?

A. He did.

Q. Did you obtain possession of the letter on the second interview, by holding out to him the inducement that he could receive money from other persons unknown to Mr. Eull, provided they could see the letter with the signatures.

A. I told Mr. Bull that I wanted that letter to exhibit to persons interested, and I added that they were not willing to pay their money unless they could see the signatures of the gentlemen.

(Signed.) S. A. Suydam.

Cross-Exammed by Mr. Johnson.—Q. At what time in the day, on the 2th March, did Mr. Bull exhibit the letter to you marked C!

A

marked C?

A. Two gentlemen of my most intimate friends advised me not to give him a dollar in any manner whatever.

Q. Did you think from his manner, or otherwise, that he was netting in good faith with Messra. Robinson and Stone in procuring the letter marked C?

A. My impression is that this committee knew all about Mr. Eull was doing.

[Mr. Walsh here objected to the crasure of a previous answer to this question, which the Committee decided was not an answer to the question.]

By Mr. Menn:—Q. Did Mr. Bull at his first interview with you, inform you that Mr. Robinson, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Stone were in New York at that time!

Mr. Johnson and Mr. Stone were in New York at that time?

A. No.

Q. Pid he at any interview, except those taking place while the Legislature were in New York, inform you that any of those gentlemen were in town!

A. No.

Q. Lid you learn that they were in town at any time prior to the Legislature visiting New York!

A. I did, some of them. I can't tell which; I saw it in the newspapers; the names published in the Express.

Q. Did Mr. Bull intimate to you at that time; the time those names were published; that he had any understanding with those gentlemen in relation to the bill? A. Yes.
Q. How and in what manner did he make the in-tiration to you, what did he say to you?
A. He said I might rest assured it would be all right; that he would make it right; he implied more than he expressed. Q. Did be mention the names of any of those gen-

A. I do not remember. A. I do not remember.

(Signed)

S. A. Suydam.

George W. Bull, called as a witness in behalf of Messrs. Robinson, Johnson, and Stone—sworn.

By Chairman.—Q. What conversation, if any, have you had with any of the Select Committee in relation to the bill to prevent gambling?

A. None, except to ask Mr. Robinson to let me know the day it was introduced.

Q. Ind he let you know the day it was introduced.

Q. Were any others in the room, except you are the persons signing the letter?

A. No.

Q. Did you speak to any of those Senators subsequently, as to letting the letter go out of your possession?

A. I did not.

Q. Did you have any conversation with them, prior to your return to Albany—after they had signed it—about it?

A. I did not.

Q. Did either of them ask you the object youhad in having it signed?

A. They did not. I gave the reason when I requested it, that I wanted to show it to a friend who was interested in the bill.

Q. Did they hesitate about the propriety of signing it, when it was presented to them?

A. They did not.

Q. How soon after that letter was signed did you present it to Mr. Suydam?

A. I think the letter was signed between 8 and 10 in the morning. I showed it to Mr. Suydam between half-past 12 and half-past 1 on the same day.

Q. Did either member of the committee dictate to you the form of the answer they signed?

A. They did not.

Q. Was it drawn up according to your own idea?

A. It was.

Q. Did you exhibit it to any person, other than

It was. Did you exhibit it to any person, other than Mr. Suydam, in New York?
A. I did not, to my recollection.
Q. Have you received money from any person to
defeat the passage of that bill?

Yes. Have you received any from Mr. Suydam?

Q. Have you received any from Mr. Suydam?
A. Never—one cent.
Q. Have you ever paid, or promised to pay, money or valuable consideration to any person whe is an officer or member of the Legislature, to defeat that bill?
A. I have not.
Q. How did you satisfy yourself that Mr. Suydam was a Free Mason?
A. From the reply he made me when I asked him the question.
Q. Did you ask Mr. Suydam "Are you a Mason?"
A. I did.
Q. What was his answer?
A. I did.
Q. What was his answer?
A. His manner to me the first time I asked him this question, was such that I considered him to be a Mason?
Q. Did you ask him, during this last interview, whether he was a Mason?

or Mr. Mills, or any of the other officers of the Senate, in relation to any compensation either you or they were to receive to procure the defeat of such bill?

A. Before heaven! there was not.

Q. Did any of the Senators, or officers of the Senate, have any knowledge or understanding, as far as you know, in relation to any interest of yours in the defeat of such bill?

A. They had not, directly or indirectly.

Q. Relate the circumstances under which the Select Committee signed the note to you, in the city of New York, marked C., and the circumstances which led thereto?

A. While the Legislature was in New York on Monday last, I inquired of the different members of the committee, respectively and apart, if I was right in the opinion that a bill for the more effectual suppression of gambling would not be reported back to the Senate, and if so, if they would sign a paper to that effect? They, each efthem, said that I was right; I then drew up the paper addressed to them, (marked C.) When I inquired of Mr. Robinson he was was eating his breakfast; Mr. Stone was in the ante room of the ladies' parlor, at the south end of the Astor House—Mr. Johnson, I met in the vestibule; Mr. Stone went with me into No. 4; I then drew up this letter and the answer; Mr. Stone signed it; Mr. Robinson came out from breakfast; I met him in the hall; I took him into the room and showed him the letter, and he signed it as chairman; I stated to them as my reason for wishing this paper, that I desired to show it to a friend of mine who was interested in that bill; they asked me no] other roasons for wishing it, nor did I give them any.

Q. Did you have any knowledge or information of the intention of Senator Robinson to introduce such a bill before he gave notice thereof in the Senate?

A. I simply had information of it from seeing it lying on his desk, with the title.

By Mr. Mann.—Q. Are the letters marked A B written by you?

A. They were written by me.

Q. Did you know whether any person furnished it him for the purpose of having it this question, was such that I considered him to be a Mason?

Q. Did you ask him, during this last interview, whether he was a Mason?

A. I asked him if he did not tell me he was a Mason, and he said no.

By Mr. Dimmick—Q. At any time during the present session, have you, directly or indirectly, intimated to any Senator or officer of the Senate, that the defeat of the bill to suppress gambling would result in any pecuniary benefit to yourself?

A. No.

Q. When you asked Mr. Stone whether the bill would not be reported, did he not say that he could not tell, as the committee had not met to consult about it, but that he presumed it would not be, as there was already as much business before the Legislature as they could accomplish?

A. I have a slight recollection of something of that sort.

Q. Did you not come to him a short time afterwards, and say to him that a friend of yours, who was interested in the bill, wished to know what the committee thought about reporting it, and ask him if he was willing to accommodate you by stating in writing what he had before stated to you?

A. There was some such conversation.

Q. Did not Mr. Stone state to you that you had better see the other members of the committee, as perhaps they would think best to report the bill?

A. My recollection is not distinct about that; there was some such conversation generally.

Q. Did he state to you after he had signed the letter, that you had better keep it in your hands, as the committee might, on consultation, think best to report the bill?

A. I do not recollect that.

Q. What did Mr. Robinson say to you when you presented the paper to him to sign?

A. I believe he stated that he was in favor of a more stringent law, on the subject

Examinate by Mr. Johnson:—Q. Did you tell Mr. Suydam, at any time before the bill had been introduced, that you would have it referre 1 to Messrs.

Robinson, Johnsoo, and Stone, or words to that effect?

A. No, I did not.

A. No, I did not.

Q. What conversation did you have with Mr. Johnson, in reference to this bill, in the ante-chamber of the Senate chamber?

A. I do not recollect having any.

Q. Did you ever state to either member of the committee anything in relation to an arrangement made with any person or persons about that bill?

A. I did not.

(Signed.)

GEO. W. BULL.

And the Committee adjourned to 5 P. M.

Free P. M.—Committee met. Present: all the Committee. A. He showed me one similar to it, but whether prior or since its introduction, I am not positive, some time during the session.

Q. Was the bill in his hand-writing that he showed you?

A. No.

A. No.
Q. Was it a printed bill?
A. No.
Q. Do you know whether he furnished it to Mr.
Robinson to be introduced? ommittee. Mr. Stone, called on the part of Mr. Suydam, in Mr. Stone, called on the part of Mr. Suydam, in the matter of the charges against Mr. Bull—sworn.

By Mr. Suydam.—Q. Were you in the city of New York, about the the 2d or 3rd of March?

A. I was not. I never was in New York but wice—once last April, and when the Legislature was down, a week ago last Friday.

(Signed.)

Mr. Johnson called on the part of Mr. Suydam— Robinson to be introduced:

A. I do not.
Q. Did you ever request any person to have a select committee appointed on such a bill in the Sen A. I have no distinct recollection of having sug

Worn. By Mr. Suydam.—Q. When were you in New York, previous to the visit of the Legislature?

A. My impression is that it was about the 7th of March; I think two weeks previous to the night when the Legislature went down.

Q. What was your business in New York on that

Q. What was your consistency of the city of New York, whose mosther resides in this city, was going home that evening. She desired my wife to go down with her. My wife and myself went down with Mrs. Taylor. A. From Mr. Mills, who had the bill handed to introduced ?

A. I did not see the original bill at any time in New York.

Ny wife and myself went down with Mrs. Taylor and her husband, at the request of Mr. Taylor.

Q. Lid Mr. Eull necompany you at the same time on the same boat?

A. He did.

Q. Lid you not converse occasionally with Mr. Eull on the boat?

A. I did, frequently.

Q. Was Mr. Robinson on board the boat that

A. I did not see the original bill at any time in New York.
Q. Did you have the original bill at any time?
A. I had it one evening long enough to make a copy, from which I got it printed.
Q. From whom did you procure it?
A. From Mr. Robinson, the chairman; I told him I merely wished to take it over to my room to look it over. it over.
Q. Did you state anything else to him about it at the time?

evening?
A. Yes.

[At this stage of the examination, Mr. Suydam requested that Mr. Robinson and Mr. Bull should leave the room while Mr. Johnson was being examined. The committee decided, this is not a case which in their judgment requires the exercise of any power to compet these parties to leave the room.]

By the Commutee—Q. What other persons accompanied you at this time!
A. Senstors Cross, Ecach, Lieutenant Governor Church. A. He was loth to let me have it. I told him I would return it to him at once, without making any mark or meddle with it in any way, except to copy s ection.
Q. Did you make a copy?
A. I made a copy, and got it printed from the A. Senstors Cross, P. Church.
Church.
Q. Was anything said to you, or in your hearing.

A. I made a copy, and got it printed from the copy.

Q. How soon did you return the original to him?

A. The next morning, I believe.

Q. Did you ever speak to him or any other member of the committee, except when you were in New York, in reference to the bill?

A. I did not except as stated above.

Q. Did you ever speak to Mr. Robinson, when the committee would meet, in reference to that bill?

A. I believe I did ask him once. He was passing: he jaid no particular attention to my question. He said: "one of these days."

Q. Did you ever speak to Mr. Johnson or Mr. Stone, except in New York, when the Legislature was there, in relation to the bill?

A. To the best of my present recollection I never have. Q. Was anything said to yon, or in your hearing, by Mr. Eull, during the passage down, or while you were in New York, concerning the bill for the suppression of gembirg?

A. There was not.

Q. When did you first learn that you were a member of the select committee, to which the bilt was referred!

member of the select committee, to which the bily
was referred?

A. I cannot tell the exact time when it was—I
recollect that Senator Robinson told me that I was
appointed with him, a select committee on the bill
for the suppression of gambing.

Q. Did you ever have any notice to attend the
meeting of the committee?

A. No formal notice. Mr. Robinson, I recollect,
spoke to me something about having a meeting,
but no time was fixed or specified.

Q. How long did you remain in New York?

A. I arrived there Saturday morning, and left
there Sunday evening. (Signed)

Mr. Robinson here stated, that he was waiting
to be examinted if it was desired.

Q. Did you ever have any conversation with eithe

on!

I nm quite positive he did not.

Who signed the letter first!
I think Mr. Johnson—I will not be sure.

Who next!

Mr. Stone signed next—Mr. Robinson last.—

f the committee, on your way to New York, when he Legislature went down, in relation to this bill? A. I did not. Q. Did you ever speak to Mr. Johnson in relation to defending a suit for you?

A. Mr. Johnson did defend a suit for me, in the fustices' Court of this city this winter, some time, think in February or March. Mr. Johnson refused o receive any remuneration for this service.

Q. Did you ever speak to any two members of the to be examined if it was desired.

Mr. Stone also expressed his willingness to submit to any further examination in relation to the charge against him.

Mr. Stone appeared before the committee, and requested to make a full statement, on oath, in relation to the transactions in which he is implicated and the committee did not deem it necessary to have him do so. Q. 13d you ever speak to any two members of the Legislature, who are lawyers, in relation to defending a suit for you?

A. I never have, except that I got Mr. Johnson to defend that suit, and I think, one day, going down the hill, I think I mentioned to Mr. Schoonmaker, that I had been chosen defendant, and that he offered to appear for me. I told him Mr. Johnson had volunteered. This was all the conversation I had.

Extraordinary Science.—We announced, a few days since, the scieden death of William Calcudar, of York, I'm., in the cars, or his retain from Harribong, where he had just taken out a policy of insurance on his life for the sum of \$5,000. We now learn that he did not die in the cars, maving gone to Harrisburg and returned on horseback, being taken sick with veniting and purging on his way back. He finally reached home at about 101 o'clock at might—returned to lie down—would not peconit his family to summon medical and—and used at about 55 o clock on Thursday morning, sitting up in a chair. His stomach was removed and summitted to a variety of the mical tests, each one of which resulted in establishing the presence of arsenic.—But timere Sum, Eprel 2. EXTRAORDINARY SCICIPE.-We announced, a few 1 had.

Q. Have you ever spoken to any lawyer, a member of the Legislature, about defending a suit, having reference in your mind to this bill!

A. No? I have not.

Q. Did the suit in regard to which Mr. Johnson and Mr. Schoonmaker had been spoken to, relate in any way to the bill before the Legislature to suppose a suppling? ny way to the our press gambling?

A. it did not.

Q. Have you ever given Mr. Mills, the Deputy Clerk, to understand that he was to receive any consideration for helping to defeat the bill?

Corron Mant Factures in Gronola.—There are 26 cotton mills in Georgia, 34 propelled by water, two by steom. Total amount of capital invested \$1,611,(10,cost of raw materials annually, \$305,543, annually occust \$1,626,485, bales of cotton nanually castemed, 18,244. Operatives 2,037; females 771; males 1,246.

consideration for helping to defeat the bill?

A. I have not.

Q. Ibid not you and Mr. Mills, together, get up that bill, and have it introduced for some purpose?

A. We did not.

Q. When you were in New York, and the committee signed the letter marked C. did they or either of them request you not to let it go out of your hands?

A. They did not. I voluntarily told him I should retain it in my possession.

Q. Did not Mr. Stone, in the presence of the other members of the committee, make that request of you! Movements of Distinguished People.

Hen R. C. Schenek, Minister to Brazil; Franklin H. Chek, Servisny of Legation, snd Hon. John S. Pendleton, Charge de Affairs to the Argentine republic, will sail for their several ports, in the United States steamer Susqueharra, from Norfolk, about the first of May.

Hen, Affred Kelly, Ohio; Col. Summer; Maj. Cross, U. S. A.; Rev. Br. Breekenraige, Ky.; Capt. B. S. Alexander, J. M. Jones, U. S. A.; Hon. W. H. Insiay, Conn.; D. Paten, J. D. Rittenheuse, U. S. N.; Hon. S. Chittenheuse, Cenn.; Hon. R. B. Springer, Phila; Hon. S. Phelips, Vt.; Hon. C. B. Stuart, Washington; Hon. O. Parta, Boston, have been among the visiters to this city during the past week. Mr. Rebinsen signed over the others.
Q. Do you not remember that you were requested by some of them—one of them—not to let that letter go out of your hands?
A. I do not. I recollect roluntarily telling them that it should not?